

DHANAÑJAYA AND HIS DVISANDHĀNA

Dr. A. N. UPADHYE, Kolhapur

Two distinguished authors, of the name Dhanañjaya, are well known in Sanskrit literature. One is the author of the *Daśarūpaka*¹ and the other, the author of the *Dvisandhāna-kāvya* (*DS*), also called *Rāghavapāṇḍavīya* (*RP*).² Traditionally, the latter is also the author of two more works, one a Sanskrit lexicon, *Nāmamāla* or *Dhanañjaya-nighaṇṭu*,³ and the second, a hymn in Sanskrit, *Viṣṇupahāra-stotra*,⁴ in praise of the Jina, possibly Ṛṣabha. Lately a good deal of fresh evidence has come to light; and it is necessary to take stock of the evidence regarding the *DS* and the age of Dhanañjaya. This, the present article attempts to do.

Dhanañjaya and his *DS* have attracted the attention of eminent Sanskrit scholars since almost the ninteties of the last century. K. B. Pathak, while editing the Terdāl Inscription,⁵ added a casual note that Śrutakīrti Traividya, mentioned in that record, is identical with Śrutakīrti Traividyaśrī referred to by Pampa according to whom he was the author of *RP* in the *gata-pratyāgata* style. He identified Dhanañjaya with Śrutakīrti and assigned him to c. 1123 A. D. He repeated this view rather elaborately in a subsequent paper also.⁶ R. G. Bhandarkar noticed two Mss. of *DS*.⁷ Accepting Dhanañjaya as the author of the *Nāmamālā* as well, he pointed out that *DS* is quoted in Vardhamāna's *Gaṇaratnamahodadhi* (A. D. 1141). Presuming that the *RP* of Kavirāja was possibly imitated by Dhanañjaya, he put both of them between A. D. 996–1141, Dhanañjaya being considerably younger than Kavirāja. E. V. Vira

1. Nirṇaya Sāgara Press Edition, Bombay, Śaka 1819.

2. Nirṇaya Sāgara Press, (*Kāvya-mālā*. No. 49), Bombay, 1895. A new edition will be soon published by the Bhāratiya Jñānapīṭha, Varanasi.

3. Bhāratiya Jñānapīṭha, Benares, 1950.

4. Edn. *Kāvya-mālā* No. 7, N. S. Press, Bombay, 1926.

5. *Indian Antiquary*, 14 (1885), 14–26.

6. *The Journal of the BBRAS*, 21 (1904) 1–3.

7. *Report on the Search of Skt. Mss. in the Bombay Presidency during the years 1884–85, 1885–86, and 1886–87*, Bombay, 1894.

Raghavacharya⁸ reached the conclusion that Dhanañjaya, the author of the *Nāmamālā* and *DS*, flourished about 750 to 800 A. D., later than Kavirāja whom he assigns to 650–725 A. D. A. Venkatasubbiah studiously refuted K. B. Pathak and reached the following conclusions.⁹ This Dhanañjaya is identical with Hemasena (c. 985) mentioned in the Śravaṇa Beḷgoḷ Inscription No. 54 (67) where he is called Vidyā-Dhanañjaya. In his opinion, it is not unlikely that this Hemasena is the author of the *RP* or the *DS-Kāvya*, and that it was written some time during A. D. 916–1000. He puts Kavirāja and his *RP* somewhere between A. D. 1236–1307, as against Pathak who assigned him to A. D. 1182–97. Most of the histories of Sanskrit literature have quietly adopted this date for Dhanañjaya.

Among the three works attributed to Dhanañjaya, the *Viṣāpahāra-stotra* is a devotional hymn in praise of Jina, presumably Vṛṣabha, in 40 Sanskrit verses (39 *Upajāti* and the last *Puṣpitāgrā*). It is composed in lucid language with catching concepts. The last verse mentions the name of the author by *śleṣa* :

वितरति विहिता यथाकथंचि—
ज्जिन विनताय मनीषितानि भक्तिः ।
त्वयि नुतिविषया पुनर्विशेषाद्
दिशति सुखानि यशो धनं जयं च ॥४०॥

A Sanskrit commentary on it is available in the Jaina Maṭha at Moodabidri (S. Kanara).

The hymn gets its title possibly from the first word in verse No. 14; and a legend has come to be associated with this hymn that a recitation of it is an antidote against poison. Some of the ideas from it, which are quite traditional in their spirit, as noted by Pt. Premi,¹⁰ seem to have been adopted by Jinasena in his *Ādipurāṇa* and by Somadeva in his *Yaśastilaka*.

The *Nāmamālā*, also called, in some of its manuscripts, *Dhanañjaya-nighaṇṭu*, is a Sanskrit lexicon of synonyms. There is also an *Anekārīhanāmamālā* attributed to him. The following verses occur at the end of his *Nāmamālā* :

प्रमाणमकलङ्कस्य पूज्यपादस्य लक्षणम् ।
द्विःसंधानकवेः काव्यं रत्नत्रयमपश्चिमम् ॥ २०१ ॥
कवेर्धनञ्जयस्येयं सत्कवीनां शिरोमणेः ।
प्रमाणं नाममालेति श्लोकानां हि शतद्वयम् ॥ २०२ ॥

8. *Journal of the Andhra Historical Research Society*, (Rajahmundry), 2. ii (1927) 181–84.

9. *JBBRAS* (New Series 3, i-ii (1927) 134 f.

10. *Jaina Sāhitya aur Itihāsa*, pp. 109 f., Bombay, 1956.

ब्रह्माणं समुपेत्य वेदनिनदव्याजात् तुषाराचल-
स्थानस्थावरमीश्वरं सुरनदीव्याजात्तथा केशवम् ।
अप्यम्भोनिधिशायिनं जलनिधिध्वानोपदेशादहो
फुत्सुर्वन्ति धनञ्जयस्य च भिया शब्दाः समुत्पीडिताः ॥ २०३ ॥

In some manuscripts¹¹ the following two verses are found added after, perhaps, No. 201, *Pramāṇam* etc. :

जाते जगति वाल्मीकौ शब्द कविरिति स्मृतः ।
कवी इति ततो व्यासे कवयश्चेति दण्डिनि ॥
कवयः कवयश्चेति बहुत्वं दूरमागतम् ।
त्रिनिवृत्तं चिरादेतत् कलौ जाते धनञ्जये ॥

It is interesting to note that the first verse, with the third *pāda* slightly different (*Vyāse jāte kavī ceti*), is attributed to Kālidāsa by Jalhana in his *Sāktimuktāvali*.¹² It could not have been composed by Kālidāsa, because it contains a reference to Daṇḍin.

Dhanañjaya, as noted above, ranks his poetic abilities with those of Akalaṅka in *Pramāṇasāstra* and of Pūjyapāda in grammar: a veritable triad of gems, two of them his outstanding predecessors. These verses leave, no doubt, that the author of the *DS* and of the *Nāmamālā* is one and the same. It seems quite natural that a poet with a thorough mastery over the ocean of Sanskrit vocabulary could easily compose a *dvisandhāna* poem.

Dhanañjaya does not give any auto-biographical details. Nemicandra, in his commentary on the *DS*,¹³ 118–146 states that Dhanañjaya was the son of Vāsudeva and Sridevi and pupil of Daśaratha.

It is necessary to put together references to Dhanañjaya and his works so that some broad limits can be put to his date. Dhanañjaya and his works have received sufficient praise; and his poem was so distinguished that he came to be called *Dvisandhāna-kavi*. The term *dvisandhāna* seems to be as old as Daṇḍin (c. 7th century A. D.); and Bhoja's observations quoted below clearly indicate that Daṇḍin also, like Dhanañjaya, had a *Dvisandhāna-prabandha* to his credit, though it has not come down to us. Possibly, it was Daṇḍin's third work besides the *Kāvyaḍarśa* and the *Daśakumāracarita*.

11. See the paper of Vira Raghavacharya mentioned above.

12. Edn., *GOS*, No. 82, Baroda, 1938, p. 45.

13. Nemicandra's commentary is included in the Jñānapīṭha edition which would be published soon.

Vardhamāna (A. D. 1141) quotes *DS* (of Dhanañjaya) 4.6., 9.51., 18.22, in his *Gaṇaratna-mahodadhi* 435, 409 and 97 of Eggeling's edition.

Bhoja (middle of the 11th century A. D.), while discussing the *Ubhayālañkāra*, gives the valuable information that Daṇḍin wrote a *Dvisandhāna-prabandha* on the stories of the *Rāmāyaṇa* and *Bhārata*.¹⁴ Cf.,

तृतीयस्य यथा दण्डिनो धनञ्जयस्य वा द्विसन्धानप्रबन्धौ रामायणमहाभारतार्थानुबन्धनाति (?)

For our purpose what is significant is that Bhoja mentions Dhanañjaya and his *DS* along with Daṇḍin and his *DS-Prabhandha*.

Prabhācandra (11th century A. D.) refers in his *Prameyakamalamārtaṇḍa* to the *DS* thus :¹⁵

ननु व्याकरणाद्यभ्यासाल्लौकिकपदवाक्यार्थप्रतिपत्तौ तदविशिष्टवैदिकपदवाक्यार्थप्रतिपत्तिरपि प्रसिद्धे-
श्रुतकाव्यादिवत् । तन्न वेदार्थप्रतिपत्तावतीन्द्रियार्थदर्शिना किञ्चित्प्रयोजनमित्यप्यसारम् । लौकिकवैदिकपदाना-
मकत्वेऽप्यनेकार्थत्वव्यवस्थितेरन्यपरिहारेण व्याचिख्यासितार्थस्य नियमयितुमशक्तेः । न च प्रकरणादिभ्यस्तन्नि-
यमस्तेषामप्यनेकप्रवृत्तेर्द्विसन्धानादिवत् ।

Vādirāja, in his *Parśvanāthacarita*,¹⁶ composed in A. D. 1025, refers to Dhanañjaya and his skill in more than one *sandhāna* :

अनेकभेदसन्धानाः खनन्तो हृदये मुहुः ।

बाणा धनञ्जयोन्मुक्ताः कर्णस्येव प्रिया कथम् ॥ १.२६ ॥

Durgasimha (c. 1025 A. D.), the author of the Kannaḍa *Pañcatantra*,¹⁷ refers to the *RP* of Dhanañjaya in these words :

अनुपमकविब्रजं जीयेने राघवपांडवीयमं पेळूदु यशो-

वनिताधीश्वरनादं धनञ्जयं वागवधूपियं केवल्लने ॥ ७ ॥

Dr. B. S. Kulkarni, Dharwar, informs me that the palm-leaf manuscript of the *Pañcatantra* from Arrah does not contain all those verses referring to the earlier poets.

Scholars are divided in their opinions whether there was only one Nāgavarmā or there were two at different times (A. D. c. 1090 and c. 1145), with some or the other works assigned to them. We get the following verse in his *Chandombudhi*,¹⁸ a work in Kannaḍa on metrics :

14. V. Raghavan, *Bhoja's Śṛṅgāraprakāśa*, (Madras, 1963), p. 406.

15. Ed., N. S. Press, (Bombay, 1912), p. 116, lines 1 ff.; Bombay 1941, p. 402.

16. Ed. Māṇikachandra D. J., *Granthamātā*, No. 4, Bombay, 1926.

17. Mysore, 1898.

18. R. Narasimhacharya, *Karṇāṭaka Kavicarite*, (Bangalore, 1961), pp. 53 ff., 154 ff.

जितबाणं हरियंतधःकृतमयूरं तारकारातियं-
ततिमाघं शिशिरांत्यदंते सुरपप्रोच्चंडकोदंडदं- ।
ते तिरोभूतगुणाढ्यनब्जवनदंताविर्भवदंडि भा-
रतदंतात्तधनञ्जयैकविभवं वाग्गुंफदोळू नाकिगं ॥

Dhanañjaya is mentioned here among earlier poets. Narsimhacharya thinks that this is a reference to the author of *DS*, but A. Venkatasubbiah opines that the author of the *Dasarūpaka* is intended.

Jalhana (c. 1257 A. D.) in his *Sūktimuktāvali*¹⁹ puts in the mouth of Rājaśekhara (c. 900 A. D.), the following verse about Dhanañjaya :

द्विःसंधाने निपुणतां स तां चक्रे धनञ्जयः ।
यया जातं फलं तस्य सतां चक्रे धनं जयः ॥ ७ ॥

This splitting of the name of the author into *dhanam* and *jaya* is quite in tune with what the author himself has done in his works.

As already pointed out by Dr. H. L. Jain,²⁰ Virasena quotes a verse useful for explaining the term *iti*, and it is the same as No. 39 of the *Nāmamālā* of Dhanañjaya.

The above references enable us to fix the limits for the age of Dhanañjaya. He must have flourished between Akalaṅka (7th–8th century A. D.) and Virasena who completed his *Dhavalā* in A. D. 816. Dhanañjaya may, therefore, be assigned to c. 800. In any case, he could not be later than Bhoja (11th century A. D.) who specifically mentions him and his *DS*.

The *DS* of Dhanañjaya has 18 cantos, comprising of 1105 verses composed in various metrical forms, his favourite forms being *Upajāti*, *Vasantatilakā*, *Sālinī*, *Svāgatā* etc. The benedictory verses in the beginning remembers (Muni-) Suvrata or Nemi, and then Sarasvatī. The story of both Rāma and the Pāṇḍavas is covered in this work, usually taking recourse to *śleṣa* (double entendre). It is a characteristic so usual with Digambara Jaina authors that the tale is said to be narrated by Gautama to King Śreṇika. The author lays more stress on dignified descriptions than on the narration of events. Most of the verses are embellished with figures of speech, and they are duly noted by the commentator. In the last canto (especially, verse No. 43 onwards) the author has illustrated many of the *Sabdālaṅkāras*, a trait common with Bhāravi, Māgha and other poets. The verse No. 143 is an illustration of *sarva-gata-pratyāgata*.

Presuming that the colophons found at the end of the cantos (but not at the end of cantos 1, 2, 16 and 18) belong to the author himself, it is clear that he gives himself the name Dhanañjaya, or Kavi, or Dvisandhāna-kavi and calls his poem *Dvisaṇḍhāna*

19. Ed., *GOS*, No. 82. Baroda, 1938, p. 46.

20. *Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama* with *Dhavalā*. vol. I. (Amraoti, 1939), Introduction, p. 62; *Ibid.*, vol. VI, p. 14.

—*kāvya*, or the *Rāghava-Pāṇḍavīya* — (a second name, *apara-nāma*) Mahākāvya. At the close of every canto, in the last verse, he mentions his name Dhanañjaya by *śleṣa*, as in the *Viṣāpahāra-stotra*; this is already imitated by Rājaśekhara in the verse put in his mouth by Jalhana.

The title *Dvisandhāna* indicates the pattern of composition in which each verse is susceptible to two interpretations, and the appellation *Rāghava-Pāṇḍavīya* connotes the contents of the poem *viz.*, that it deals with the tales of Rāma and the Pāṇḍavas simultaneously. The cycle of tales connected with these two are so much an inseparable part of Indian cultural heritage that any poet who wants to pick up two topics at one and the same time, would easily turn to them, especially because independent epics dealing with them and giving plenty of details and contexts for alternative selection and presentation are available in large numbers. The title *Rāghava-Pāṇḍavīya* is sufficiently popular. Beside Dhanañjaya, it has been chosen by poets like Kavirāja, Śrutakīrti etc.; and there are also similar titles, e. g. *Raghava-Yūdavīya*, *Rāghava-Pāṇḍava*, *Yūdavīya*, etc. With Dhanañjaya, however, the primary title for his *kāvya* is *Dvisandhāna*; and and he, after Daṇḍin, seems to be the pioneer of this type; the *Rāgdava-Pāṇḍavīya* is only a secondary title.

It is interesting to compare the poems of Dhanañjaya and Kavirāja.²¹ Dhanañjaya's *kāvya* has an alternative name *RP* which is the sole title of Kavirāja's poem. Dhanañjaya has eighteen cantos with 1105 verses, while Kavirāja has thirteen with 664 verses. Dhanañjaya mentions his own name by *śleṣa* (thus marking his *kāvya* ' *Dhanañjayāṅka* '), while Kavirāja mentions the name of his patron Kāmadeva in the last verse of each canto : in fact the latter's poem is ' *Kāmadevāṅka* '. A detailed comparison of the contents of these two poems is a desideratum. On a cursory reading one feels that there is not much striking similarity between them. Dhanañjaya has more of descriptions, while Kavirāja narrates the details of his tale successfully in spite of the handicap of *śleṣa* (see l. 54, 69, etc.). So far as *śleṣa* is concerned, Kavirāja shows more skill and mastery over vocabulary. Dhanañjaya's poem is complimented as a ' monument of poetic excellence ' : undoubtedly, he shows a good deal of learning, especially of the *nītiśāstra*; and some of his *arthāntaranyāsas* are really profound and striking. As contrasted with Kavirāja's style, which is lucid and delightful, (*cf.* 2.11–13), Dhanañjaya writes rather heavy Sanskrit which often needs some effort to understand. In his descriptions, there are very few verses of *double entendre* which are the normal feature of Kavirāja's composition. As far as we have seen, there is very little between these two poems as to suggest that one is an imitation of the other.

There is one more poet, Śrutakīrti Traividya, who wrote a *Rāghava-Pāṇḍavīya-kāvya* of the *gatapratyāgata* pattern, a matter of curiosity and wonder among the

21. Edn. N. S. Press, Bombay, 1897, with the commentary of *Saśadhara*, *Kāvyamālā*, No. 62.

learned, as mentioned by Nāgacandra or Abhinava Pampa in his *Rāmacandra-carita-Purāṇa*,²² in Kannada, also known as *Pampa-Rāmāyaṇa* (1.24-25) :

आवां वादिकथात्रयप्रवणदांलु विद्वज्जनं मैच्चै वि-
 द्वावष्टंभमनप्पु परवादिक्षोणिभूषक्षमं ।
 देवेन्द्रं कडितंददिदं कडिदं स्याद्वादविद्यास्त्रदिं
 त्रैविद्यश्रुतकीर्ति दिव्यमुनिबोल् विख्यातियं ताळदिदं ॥२४॥
 श्रुतकीर्तित्रैविद्य-
 व्रति राघवपांडवीयमं विबुधचम-
 कृतियेनिसि गतप्रत्या-
 गतदिं पेळ्दमळकीर्तियं प्रकटिसिदं ॥२५॥

These two verses are quoted in an inscription at Śravaṇa Beḷgoḷ No. 40 (64), of A. D. 1163.²³ This Śrutakīrti Traividya is mentioned in the Terdāl inscription of 1123 A. D.

ततु परवादीभपंचाननर सधम्मरु । श्रुतकीर्तित्रैविद्यव्रतिपर् षटुत्कर्कककर्कशरु परवादिप्रतिभाप्रदी-
 पपवनर् जितदोषर् नेगळ्दरखिलभुवनांतरदोळु ॥

King Goṅka sent for Māghanandi Saiddhāntika (the preceptor of Nimba Sāmanta) of Kollagiri or Kolhapur, and the latter's colleagues were Kanakanandi Paṇḍitadeva and Śrutakīrti Traividya. In another inscription of A. D. 1135, from Kolhapur, Śrutakīrti Traividya is referred to as the Ācārya of the Rūpanārāyaṇa Basadi of Kolhapur :²⁴

शकवर्षद सासिरदय्वत्तेटनेय राक्षससंवत्सरद कार्तिकबहुलपंचमि सोमवारदंदु श्रीमूलसंघदेसीयगण-
 पुस्तक गच्छद कोल्लापुरद श्रीरूपनारायणबसदियाचार्यरण श्रीश्रुतकीर्तित्रैविद्यदेवर कालं कर्चि etc.

Nāgacandra calls him a *vratī* and so also the Terdāl inscription; *i. e.*, he was a *vratī* in 1123, but by 1135 A. D. he had reached the status of an *Ācārya*. Expert opinion puts Nāgacandra near about A. D. 1100.²⁵ This means that Śrutakīrti's age ranges from c. 1100 to 1150 A. D., approximately. So far no manuscript of his *RP* has come to light.

K. B. Pathak was the first to postulate the identity of Dhanañjaya and Śrutakīrti from the latter's having composed the *Rāghavapāṇḍaviya*. Rightly enough, R. G. Bhandarkar hesitated to accept this identity. But somehow the date proposed for Dhanañjaya based on this identity attained currency.

22. A Ms. is being used, but the text is available in printed form.

23. *Epigraphia Carnatica*, Vol. II, Śravaṇa Beḷgoḷ Inscriptions.

24. *Epigraphia Indica*, Vol. 19, p. 30.

25. R. Narasimhacharya, *Karṇāṭaka Kavicarite*, vol. I, (Bangalore 1961), pp. 110 f.

Dhanañjaya and his *DS* or *RP* have to be distinguished from Śrutakīrti and his *RP*. First, Dhanañjaya was a householder, while Śrutakīrti, a *vratin* and later an *Ācārya*. Secondly, neither Dhanañjaya nor the sources which mention Śrutakīrti give any evidence to suppose that the two names stand for the same poet. Thirdly, a verse from Dhanañjaya's *Nāmamālā* is quoted by Virasena (A. D. 816); and his *DS*, specifically mentioning the name Dhanañjaya, is referred to by Bhoja (c. 1010–62 A. D.), while the period of Śrutakīrti ranges from 1100 to 1150 A. D. Lastly, if the *DS* of Dhanañjaya is already famous to be ranked with the work of Daṇḍin and to be referred to by Bhoja (middle of the 11th century), it cannot be the same work as that of Śrutakīrti who was an *Ācārya* in 1135 A. D. So this identification has no basis; and therefore, the date, based on this identity proposed for Dhanañjaya, namely 1123–40 A. D., has to be given up.

E. V. Vira Raghavacharya's suggestion of the date for Dhanañjaya (c. 750–800) is nearer the point, but it is not known why he puts Kavirāja earlier than Dhanañjaya when Kavirāja specifically refers to Muñja of Dhārā (973–95 A. D.).

Prof. Venkatasubbiah's thesis, viz., that Dhanañjaya, the author of *DS*, is identical with Hemasena because the later is mentioned as Vidyā–Dhanañjaya in the Sravaṇa Belgol Inscription, cannot be accepted. Vādirāja is mentioning in his poem earlier authors and teachers and not necessarily his pontifical predecessors. That Dhanañjaya therefore, was a pontifical predecessor of Vādirāja and identical with Hemasena is not justified. First, Dhanañjaya was a householder. He has not at all mentioned his ascetic line, nor does he speak about his ascetic predecessors; he cannot, therefore, be a pontifical predecessor of Vādirāja. Secondly, nowhere in his works, has Dhanañjaya given his name as Hemasena. Lastly, it is very doubtful whether Vidyā–Dhanañjaya is a proper name, for it could be read as well *vidyā dhanam jaya-padam viśadam dadhāno*. It is also possible that Dhanañjaya here means Arjuna; so Hemasena is Vidyā–Dhanañjaya. If at all Vidyā–Dhanañjaya is a proper name, then, it means that it only distinguishes Hemasena from some other Dhanañjaya who flourished earlier.
